

REMARKS

Applicant is filing this Response within the shortened statutory period. Consequently, Applicant believes that no fee is due with this filing; however, if a fee is due please charge Deposit Account No. 502295.

Claims 1-18 were presented for examination. The Office Action mailed April 17, 2007 rejects claims 1-18. Applicant herein amends claims 1, 7 and 15 to more clearly recite Applicant's invention. Applicant herein cancels claims 5, 6, 9-14, 17 and 18. Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 15 and 16 remain pending in the application.

Applicant thanks Examiner Zheng Wei for the courtesy of a telephonic interview on May 22, 2007. The Examiner and Applicant's representative, William Guerin, discussed the invention generally and discussed the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,035,121 to Chiu et al. Mr. Guerin explained that Chiu does not teach or suggest "concurrent modifications," "two-way synchronization" and artifacts that are interdependent, as described in more detail below. Examiner Wei and Mr. Guerin also discussed clarifying amendments for independent claim 1.

Rejection of Claims 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. §101

The Office Action rejects claims 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant herein cancels claims 11-14 thereby rendering the rejection moot.

Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 15-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,035,121 to Chiu et al. (hereafter "Chiu"). Claims 5, 6, 17 and 18 are herein canceled therefore their rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is rendered moot. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection to the extent it is maintained against claims 1, 2,

15 and 16 as now set forth because the cited reference does not teach or suggest each and every element of Applicant's claimed invention.

Development of software code is often based on the use of a software modeling tool. A software model is developed and code is then generated from the model. The code is modified and the changes in the code are used to transform the software model. This back and forth process can be repeated until a final version of the code is established. Changes can be made to the software model and to the code in parallel, that is, concurrently. Changes made to the software model can conflict with changes made to the code, and changes made to the code can conflict with changes made to the software model.

Applicant's invention relates to a method for synchronizing concurrently modified interdependent semi-derived artifacts (SDAs). An SDA is a file that is generated in part through a transformation and in part through direct editing. In one embodiment, a code file (the SDA) is generated by a forward engineering operation from a software model (the "primary artifact") and by the editing of a programmer. In contrast, the code file is the primary artifact and the software modeling file is the SDA when a reverse engineering operation is used. The software model and code file are linked as a primary artifact and SDA, respectively, or as an SDA and primary artifact, respectively, according to the particular engineering operation that is applied. Thus the software model and code file are interdependent SDAs (paragraphs [0020] and [0021]).

In some software development activities as described above concurrent changes are made to the code and the software model. Applicant's claimed method enables the synchronization of the SDAs even though concurrent changes have been made to the SDAs after the most recent synchronization.

Chiu discloses a method and system for localizing a computer program. Localization according to Chiu results in a version of a computer program that is compatible with the requirements (such as language) of each country in which the program is used (column 1, lines 36-43). The Chiu process is shown in FIG. 2 where a leverage tool operates on a new

US resource DLL, the old US resource DLL/EXE and the old target language resource DLL. The “product” generated by the leverage tool includes (1) a new target language resource DLL containing the already-translated strings leveraged from the current version, previous version and previous target language DLLs; and (2) a resource database that has all of the resource strings of the current version resource DLL constructed as translation records (column 4, line 35 to column 5, line 18).

Representative claim 1 of Applicant’s invention recites that the first and second artifacts are “interdependent and concurrently modified.”

The method described in Chiu is one-way, that is, translation is always described in one direction, and therefore there is no interdependence. More specifically, the computer program is developed in one language (e.g., English) and then the method of Chiu is utilized to generate something that can be used by translators to generate “localized” versions of the computer program. There are no changes made in the local language which are then used to go back and modify the version in the development language. Thus the files are not interdependent.

In addition, the files in Chiu are not concurrently modified. Again, the software development occurs only in one language. The software program is adapted at a later time for the second (localized) language using the method disclosed in Chiu. To have concurrent modification in Chiu would mean that the software was being developed in two languages at the same time. Unlike our software development environment, there is no risk in Chiu of competing changes (i.e., concurrent modifications) to the two language versions. Thus Chiu does not have to synchronize concurrent changes made in both languages.

As Chiu does not teach or suggest each and every limitation in claim 1 as now set forth, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be withdrawn. Independent claim 15 as now set forth includes similar language to representative claim 1 and therefore is patentable for at least those reasons provided with respect to claim 1. Claims 2 and 16 depends directly from patentable independent claims 1 and 15, and

incorporate all of the limitations of the respective independent claim. Therefore Applicant submits that dependent claims 2 and 16 are also patentably distinguishable over the cited reference for at least those reasons provided in connection with claim 1, and Applicant requests that the rejection against claims 2 and 16 be withdrawn.

Rejections of Claims 3, 4 and 7-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office Action rejects claims 7-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiu. The Office Action rejects claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chiu in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0034846 to Ortal et al. (hereafter "Ortal"). Claims 9-14 are herein canceled therefore their rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is rendered moot. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections to the extent they are maintained against claims 3, 4, 7 and 8 as now set forth because the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of Applicant's claimed invention.

Independent claim 7 as now set forth includes similar language to representative claim 1 and therefore is patentable for at least those reasons provided with respect to claim 1. Claims 3, 4 and 8 depend directly or indirectly from patentable independent claims 1 and 7, and incorporate all of the limitations of the respective independent claim. Therefore Applicant submits that dependent claims 3, 4 and 8 are allowable as they depend from allowable base claims. Thus Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 3, 4, 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims that have not been expressed.

In view of the remarks made herein, Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance and request early favorable action by the Examiner.

If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with the Applicant's representative would expedite allowance of this application, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned at (508) 303-2003.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 13, 2007
Reg. No. 41,047

Tel. No.: (508) 303-2003
Fax No.: (508) 303-0005

/William G. Guerin/
William G. Guerin
Attorney for Applicant
Guerin & Rodriguez, LLP
5 Mount Royal Avenue
Marlborough, MA 01752